On (Secure) Information flow for Multiple-Unicast Sessions: Analysis with Butterfly Network

Gaurav Kumar Agarwal, Martina Cardone, Christina Fragouli
Department of Electrical Engineering
University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA
Email: {gauravagarwal, martina.cardone, christina.fragouli}@ucla.edu

arXiv:1606.07561v1 [cs.IT] 24 Jun 2016

***Abstract*—This paper considers a class of wireline networks, derived from the well-known butterfly network, over which two independent unicast sessions take place simultaneously. The main objectives are to understand when network coding type of operations are beneficial with and without security considerations and to derive the ultimate gains that cooperation among sources and sinks can bring. Towards these goals, the capacity region of the butterfly network with arbitrary edge capacities is first derived. It is then shown that no rate can be guaranteed over this network under security considerations, when an eavesdropper wiretaps any of the links. Three variants of the butterfly network, such as the case of co-located sources, are analyzed as well and their secure and non-secure capacity regions are characterized. By using the butterfly network and its variants as building blocks, these results can be used to design high-throughput achieving transmission schemes for general multiple-unicast networks.**

I. Introduction

The focus of this work is on a class of wireline networks, derived from the famous buttefly network, over which two independent unicast sessions take place simultaneously. Our goal is two-fold: (i) we seek to understand when network coding type of operations are beneficial with and without security considerations and (ii) we aim to find the ultimate gains that cooperation among sources and sinks can bring.

The characterization of the capacity of multiple-unicast wireline networks is a long-standing open problem, even for the two-unicast network. In particular, in [1] the authors proved that solving the two-unicast problem (for general rate pairs) is as hard as solving the k-unicast problem, with $k \geq 3$. For a general two-unicast network with integer edge capacities, the authors in [2] derived necessary and sufficient conditions to achieve the point $(1, 1)$. However, the assumption of integer edge capacities is crucial and the result does not appear to easily generalize to obtain the conditions for achieving other points, such as $(2, 2)$. Different from muticast networks for which linear network coding suffices for capacity characterization [3], it is proved to be not sufficient for the case of multiple-unicast networks [4], even for the two-unicast problem [1]. This fact led to the design of several suboptimal transmission strategies. For example, in [5] the authors designed achievable schemes for general networks by using as a building block the famous butterfly network with uniform edge capacities, for which XORing based operations are optimal.

The work of the authors was partially funded by NSF under award 1321120. G. K. Agarwal is also supported by the Guru Krupa Fellowship.

Since the problem of characterizing the capacity of multiple-unicast networks is open, to the best of our knowledge, the case of secure communication has not been analyzed. For multicast traffic, in [6] the authors considered uniform edge capacities and showed that the cut-set bound is tight, when a passive eavesdropper has access to any k channels. Recently, in [7] a more general case was considered where edges are of arbitrary capacities; however, for this scenario the cut-set bound is not tight and hence the problem remains open even in the single unicast case. Thus, it is not surprising that no work considered the case of security for multiple-unicast scenarios.

In this paper, we analyze the celebrated butterfly network in Fig. 1, where the edge capacities are arbitrary. We first characterize its capacity region without security constraints, by designing a scheme that achieves the generalized network sharing outer bound derived in [8]. We then prove that secure communication is not possible over this network, when a passive eavesdropper wiretaps any of the links. We finally derive secure and non-secure capacity results for other three two-unicast networks derived from the butterfly network, namely: (i) the case of co-located sources in Fig. 2; (ii) the case of co-located sinks in Fig. 3; (iii) a modified version of the butterfly network in Fig. 4. On the one hand, these results, by using the butterfly network and its variants as building blocks, can be used to design high-throughput achieving transmission schemes for general multiple-unicast networks with and without security considerations. On the other hand, the results here presented provide network examples for which coding across sessions is not necessary in absence of security, but it becomes of fundamental importance under security constraints. This observation is in line with our previous work in [9] where we proved that network coding type of operations (which are not beneficial in absence of security) are crucial for characterizing the secret capacity region of three two-unicast networks with erasure channels. Finally, the capacity results here derived shed light on the ultimate gains that can be achieved by allowing cooperation among the two sources or the two destinations.

In Section II we define our setup. In Section III we derive our main result, namely we characterize the capacity for the four networks in Table I with and without security considerations. Finally, in Section IV we draw conclusions and we briefly discuss how the results presented in this work can be used to design high-throughput achieving transmission schemes for a general multiple-unicast network.

II. SETUP

A wireline network is represented by a directed acyclic graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V}$ is the vertex (node) set and $\mathcal{E}$ is the set of the directed edges. Each edge $e \in \mathcal{E}$ represents a noiseless orthogonal channel of capacity C_e. If an edge $e \in \mathcal{E}$ connects a node i to a node j, we refer to node i as the tail and to node j as the head of the edge e. For each node $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we define $\mathcal{I}(v)$ as the set of all incoming edges of node v and $\mathcal{O}(v)$ as the set of all outgoing edges of node v.

For a two-unicast system, there are two source nodes S_1 and S_2 and two sink (destination) nodes D_1 and D_2. These source and destination nodes can be co-located, i.e., the two sources or/and the two destinations can be gathered together in a single node. Each source has an independent message that has to be communicated to the corresponding destination. We are interested in the rates at which these messages can be reliably communicated with and without security constraints.

Source $\mathsf{S}_i, i \in [1:2]$ has a message W_i that has to be reliably decoded at node D_i. The messages W_1 and W_2 are independent, uniformly drawn from a finite alphabet set and are of q-ary entropy rates R_1 and R_2, respectively. Each channel is a discrete noiseless channel accepting alphabets over $\mathbb{F}_q$. The symbol transmitted (respectively, received) over n channel uses on edge $e \in \mathcal{E}$ is denoted as X_e^n (respectively, Y_e^n). Clearly, since channels are noiseless, $Y_{ei} = X_{ei}, \forall i \in [1:n]$.

Definition 1. *A rate pair (R_1, R_2) is said to be achievable if there exist a block length n, a set of encoding functions $f_e,\ \forall e \in \mathcal{E}$, such that*

$$X_e^n = \begin{cases} f_e(W_1, W_2) & \text{if } tail(e) = \{\mathsf{S}_1, \mathsf{S}_2\} \\ f_e(W_1) & \text{if } tail(e) = \{\mathsf{S}_1\} \\ f_e(W_2) & \text{if } tail(e) = \{\mathsf{S}_2\} \\ f_e(\{Y_\ell^n : \ell \in \mathcal{I}(tail(e))\}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

and a set of two decoding functions ϕ_j for $j \in [1:2]$, such that destination D_j can decode W_j with high probability, i.e., $\Pr(\phi_j(\{Y_\ell^n : \ell \in \mathcal{I}(\mathsf{D}_j)\}) \neq W_j) < n\epsilon_n, \forall \epsilon_n > 0$.

We are also interested in finding the rate pairs at which the two messages W_1 and W_2 can be communicated securely. In particular, we assume that a passive eavesdropper wiretaps one channel, which one exactly is not known. This assumption is equivalent to have one eavesdropper on every link, but these eavesdroppers do not cooperate among themselves. We let $Z_e^n, e \in \mathcal{E}$ be the symbol received by the eavesdropper on edge e over n channel uses. Clearly, $X_{ei} = Y_{ei} = Z_{ei}, \forall i \in [1:n]$. We also assume that for $j \in [1:2], \mathsf{S}_j$ has an independent and infinite source of randomness Θ_j.

Definition 2. *A rate pair (R_1, R_2) is said to be securely achievable if there exist a block length n, a set of encoding functions $f_e,\ \forall e \in \mathcal{E}$ such that*

$$X_e^n = \begin{cases} f_e(W_1, W_2, \Theta_1, \Theta_2) & \text{if } tail(e) = \{\mathsf{S}_1, \mathsf{S}_2\} \\ f_e(W_1, \Theta_1) & \text{if } tail(e) = \{\mathsf{S}_1\} \\ f_e(W_2, \Theta_2) & \text{if } tail(e) = \{\mathsf{S}_2\} \\ f_e(\{Y_\ell^n : \ell \in \mathcal{I}(tail(e))\}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

and a set of two decoding functions ϕ_j for $j \in [1:2]$, such that destination D_j can reliably decode the message W_j (see Definition 1) and such that $\forall e \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\forall \epsilon_n > 0$ $I(W_1, W_2; Z_e^n) < \epsilon_n$ (strong secrecy requirement).

III. MAIN RESULT

In this section we derive the capacity region with and without security constraints for the four 2-unicast networks reported in Table I. In particular: (i) the network in Fig. 1 is the classical butterfly network, which we refer to butterfly network 1; (ii) the network in Fig. 4 is a modified version of the classical butterfly network, which we refer to butterfly network 2; (iii) the network in Fig. 2 is a particular case of the butterfly networks in Fig. 1 and Fig. 4 (with the role of C_4 and C_5 swapped) when the sources are co-located; (iv) the network in Fig. 3 is a particular case of the butterfly networks in Fig. 1 and Fig. 4 when the destinations are co-located. It is worth noting that when the two sources in Fig. 1 are merged to get the network in Fig. 2, the source is connected to M_1 through two parallel edges of capacities C_1 and C_2. We replaced these two parallel edges by one edge of capacity $\mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2$; while this operation is without loss of generality if there are no security constraints, it might be with loss of optimality under security considerations, since the eavesdropper can now wiretap an edge of capacity $\mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2$, which is not possible in the case of parallel edges. However, our outer bounds (proved to be tight) are derived by considering the case where the eavesdropper never wiretaps the edge of capacity $\mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2$. Hence, this operation is without loss of generality also under security considerations. A similar argument holds for the case of co-located sinks, i.e., the two parallel edges of capacity C_6 and C_7 can be safely replaced by one edge of capacity $\mathsf{C}_6 + \mathsf{C}_7$. Table I also reports, for each analyzed network, the capacity regions with and without security constraints, which are derived in the rest of this section.

A. Butterfly Network 1

We start by considering the butterfly network 1 in Fig. 1 without security constraints. We notice that the rate region in (1) is an outer bound on the capacity region of the butterfly network 1 in Fig. 1 since: (i) the single rate constraints in (1a) and (1b) are cut-constraints (from the max-flow min-cut theorem) and (ii) the sum-rate constraints in (1c) and (1d) follow from the GNS outer bound in [8, Theorem 2]. We now show that the rate region in (1) is achievable. In particular,

Theorem III.1. *For the butterfly network 1 in Fig. 1, the following rate region is achievable:*

$$R_1 \leq \min(\mathsf{C}_1, \mathsf{C}_7), \tag{8a}$$
$$R_2 \leq \min(\mathsf{C}_2, \mathsf{C}_6), \tag{8b}$$
$$R_1 + R_2 \leq \mathsf{C}_3 + \min(R_2, \mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_5), \tag{8c}$$
$$R_1 + R_2 \leq \mathsf{C}_3 + \min(R_1, \mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_5). \tag{8d}$$

It is not difficult to see that the rate regions in (8) and (1) are equivalent. Hence, the rate region in (1) is the capacity region for the butterfly network 1 in Fig. 1.

TABLE I: Networks of interest and their capacity regions with and without security constraints.

Network	 Fig. 1: Butterfly Network 1.	 Fig. 2: Butterfly Network with Co-Located Sources.	 Fig. 3: Butterfly Network with Co-Located Sinks.	 Fig. 4: Butterfly Network 2.
Without Security	$R_1 \le \min\{\mathsf{C}_1, \mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_7\}$, (1a) $R_2 \le \min\{\mathsf{C}_2, \mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_6\}$, (1b) $R_1 + R_2 \le \mathsf{C}_3 + \mathsf{C}_4$, (1c) $R_1 + R_2 \le \mathsf{C}_3 + \mathsf{C}_5$. (1d)	$R_1 \le \mathsf{C}_5 + \min\{\mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2, \mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_7\}$, (2a) $R_2 \le \mathsf{C}_4 + \min\{\mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2, \mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_6\}$, (2b) $R_1 + R_2 \le \mathsf{C}_4 + \mathsf{C}_5 + \min\{\mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2, \mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_6 + \mathsf{C}_7\}$. (2c)	$R_1 \le \mathsf{C}_4 + \min\{\mathsf{C}_1, \mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_6 + \mathsf{C}_7\}$, (3a) $R_2 \le \mathsf{C}_5 + \min\{\mathsf{C}_2, \mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_6 + \mathsf{C}_7\}$, (3b) $R_1 + R_2 \le \mathsf{C}_4 + \mathsf{C}_5 + \min\{\mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2, \mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_6 + \mathsf{C}_7\}$. (3c)	$R_1 \le \mathsf{C}_4 + \min\{\mathsf{C}_1, \mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_7\}$, (4a) $R_2 \le \mathsf{C}_5 + \min\{\mathsf{C}_2, \mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_6\}$, (4b) $R_1 + R_2 \le \mathsf{C}_4 + \mathsf{C}_5 + \mathsf{C}_3$. (4c)
With Security	Secure communication is not possible.	$R_1 \le \min\{\mathsf{C}_5, \mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2, \mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_7\}$, (5a) $R_2 \le \min\{\mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2, \mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_6\}$. (5b)	$R_1 \le \min\{\mathsf{C}_1, \mathsf{C}_4\}$, (6a) $R_2 \le \min\{\mathsf{C}_2, \mathsf{C}_5\}$, (6b) $R_1 + R_2 \le \min\{\mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_6 + \mathsf{C}_7\}$. (6c)	$R_1 \le \min\{\mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_1, \mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_7\}$, (7a) $R_2 \le \min\{\mathsf{C}_5, \mathsf{C}_2, \mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_6\}$, (7b) $R_1 + R_2 \le \mathsf{C}_3$. (7c)

Proof: Without loss of generality, we assume $R_1 \le R_2$, i.e., the constraint in (8c) is redundant. Consider a rate pair (R_1, R_2) satisfying the constraints in (8). The transmission scheme is as follows.

- $\mathsf{S}_i, i \in [1:2]$ sends R_i packets on edge i, which is possible thanks to the constraints in (8a) and (8b).
- The intermediate node M_1 is responsible of two operations: (i) it first merges $\min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_5\}$ packets received from S_1 with the same amount of packets received from S_2, which is possible since we are assuming $R_1 \le R_2$; after this first operation there are $\min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_5\}$ mixed packets and $R_1 + R_2 - 2\min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_5\}$ uncoded packets (of which $R_i - \min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_5\}$ were received from S_i, $i \in [1:2]$); (ii) it then sends both these types of messages (i.e., coded and uncoded) on edge 3, which is possible thanks to the constraint in (8d).
- The intermediate node M_2 on edge 6 (respectively, edge 7) sends: (i) $R_2 - \min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_5\}$ (respectively, $R_1 - \min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_5\}$) uncoded packets that were transmitted by S_2 (respectively, S_1) and (ii) all the $\min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_5\}$ mixed packets received from M_1; this operation is possible thanks to the constraint in (8b), i.e., $R_2 \le \mathsf{C}_6$ (respectively, constraint in (8a), i.e., $R_1 \le \mathsf{C}_7$).
- Source S_1 (respectively, S_2) on edge 4 (respectively, edge 5) sends the $\min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_5\}$ packets that were mixed at the intermediate node M_1; notice that this operation is possible since $\min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_5\} \le \min\{\mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_5\}$.
- Destination D_1 on edge 7 receives $R_1 - \min(R_1, \mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_5)$ uncoded packets of S_1 and $\min(R_1, \mathsf{C}_4, \mathsf{C}_5)$ packets of S_1 mixed with same number of packets of S_2, which are also received (uncoded) on edge 5. Thus, node D_1 can recover the packets of S_1 from the coded packets that it receives on edge 7. Similarly, node D_2 can successfully decode all the packets that were sent by source S_2.

■

We now consider the butterfly network 1 in Fig. 1 with security constraints. In particular,

Theorem III.2. *For the butterfly network 1 in Fig. 1, secure communication is not possible.*

Proof: We consider block coding with block length n and secret message rate $R_j, j \in [1:2]$. With this, from the strong secrecy requirement we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} nR_1 &\le H(W_1) = I(W_1; Y_1^n) + H(W_1|Y_1^n) \\ &< \epsilon_n + H(W_1|Y_1^n) \\ &= I(W_1; Y_2^n, Y_5^n|Y_1^n) + H(W_1|Y_1^n, Y_2^n, Y_5^n) + \epsilon_n \\ &\overset{(a)}{\le} I(W_1; Y_2^n, Y_5^n|Y_1^n) + H(W_1|Y_3^n, Y_5^n) + \epsilon_n \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} I\left(W_1; Y_2^n, Y_5^n | Y_1^n\right) + H\left(W_1 | Y_7^n, Y_5^n\right) + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} I\left(W_1; Y_2^n, Y_5^n | Y_1^n\right) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&= H\left(Y_2^n, Y_5^n | Y_1^n\right) - H\left(Y_2^n, Y_5^n | Y_1^n, W_1\right) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} H\left(Y_2^n, Y_5^n | Y_1^n\right) - H\left(Y_2^n, Y_5^n | Y_1^n, W_1, \Theta_1\right) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(e)}{=} H\left(Y_2^n, Y_5^n | Y_1^n\right) - H\left(Y_2^n, Y_5^n | W_1, \Theta_1\right) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(f)}{=} H\left(Y_2^n, Y_5^n | Y_1^n\right) - H\left(Y_2^n, Y_5^n\right) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\leq n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n,
\end{aligned}
$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows since Y_3^n is a deterministic function of (Y_1^n, Y_2^n) and because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (ii) the inequality in (b) follows since Y_7^n is a deterministic function of Y_3^n and because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (iii) the inequality in (c) follows because of the decodability constraint; (iv) the inequality in (d) is due to the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (v) the equality in (e) follows since Y_1^n is a deterministic function of (W_1, Θ_1); (vi) finally, the equality in (f) follows since (Y_2^n, Y_5^n) is independent of (W_1, Θ_1). By dividing both sides by n and taking the limit for $n \to \infty$, we get $R_1 = 0$. By following similar steps, one can derive $R_2 = 0$. Hence, if do not have knowledge about the edge Eve is wiretapping, then a secure communication over the butterfly network 1 in Fig. 1 is not possible. ■

B. Butterfly Network with Co-Located Sources

We consider the butterfly network with co-located sources in Fig. 2 with no security constraints. We notice that the rate region in (2) is an outer bound on the capacity region of the network in Fig. 2 since all the rate constraints are cut-constraints (from the max-flow min-cut theorem). We now show that the rate region in (2) is achievable. In particular,

Theorem III.3. *For the butterfly network with co-located sources in Fig. 2, the following rate region is achievable:*

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_1 &\leq \mathsf{C}_7 + \min\left\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_5\right\}, && \text{(9a)} \\
R_2 &\leq \mathsf{C}_6 + \min\left\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_4\right\}, && \text{(9b)} \\
R_1 + R_2 &\leq \min\left\{\mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2, \mathsf{C}_3\right\} + \min\left\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_4\right\} \\
&\quad + \min\left\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_5\right\}. && \text{(9c)}
\end{aligned}
$$

It is not difficult to see that the regions in (9) and (2) are equivalent. Hence, the rate region in (2) is the capacity region for the butterfly network with co-located sources in Fig. 2.

Proof: Consider a rate pair (R_1, R_2) satisfying the constraints in (9). The transmission scheme is as follows.

- The source sends $\min\left\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_5\right\}$ packets for D_1 on edge 5, which is possible since $\min\left\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_5\right\} \leq \mathsf{C}_5$. Similarly, the source sends $\min\left\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_4\right\}$ packets for D_2 on edge 4. Moreover, on the link of capacity $(\mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2)$, the source sends $R_1 - \min\left\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_5\right\}$ packets for D_1 and $R_2 - \min\left\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_4\right\}$ packets for D_2. This operation is possible thanks to the constraint in (9c).
- The intermediate node M_1 simply sends the $R_1 - \min\left\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_5\right\}$ packets for D_1 and the $R_2 - \min\left\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_4\right\}$ packets for D_2 on edge 3, which is possible thanks to the constraint in (9c).
- The intermediate node M_2 sends the $R_1 - \min\left\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_5\right\}$ packets for D_1 (received from M_1) on edge 7, which is possible thanks to the constraint in (9a). Similarly, M_2 sends the $R_2 - \min\left\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_4\right\}$ packets for D_2 on edge 6, which is possible thanks to the constraint in (9b).
- Node D_1 (respectively, D_2) successfully recovers a total of useful (i.e., those the source wished to explicitly communicate to D_1) R_1 (respectively, R_2) uncoded packets.

■

We now consider the network in Fig. 2 with security constraints. In particular,

Theorem III.4. *For the butterfly network with co-located sources in Fig. 2, the secure capacity region is given by* (5) *in Table I.*

Proof: We here prove that the rate region in (5) in Table I is achievable. The proof that the rate region in (5) is also an outer bound on the secure capacity region of the butterfly network with co-located sources is reported in Appendix A. Consider a secure rate pair (R_1, R_2) satisfying the constraints in (5). The transmission scheme is as follows.

- The source sends $K = \max\left\{R_1, R_2\right\}$ random packets on the edge of capacity $\mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2$. These packets are used to generate a secret key. This operation is possible thanks to the constraints in (5a) and in (5b).
- The intermediate node M_1 simply sends the K random packets on edge 3, which is possible thanks to the constraints in (5a) and in (5b).
- The intermediate node M_2 sends R_1 random packets (out the K ones received from M_1) on edge 7, which we refer to as K_1. Similarly, out of the K random packets received from M_1, M_2 sends R_2 random packets on edge 6, which we refer to as K_2. These operations are possible thanks to the constraints in (5a) and in (5b).
- The source sends R_1 message packets for D_1 encrypted with the key K_1 on edge 5 (possible because of (5a)). Similarly, it sends R_2 message packets for D_2 encrypted with the key K_2 on edge 4 (possible because of (5b)).
- Node D_1 (respectively, D_2) receives R_1 (respectively, R_2) encrypted useful packets from the source on edge 5 (respectively, 4). Hence, by using the key K_1 (respectively, K_2) received from M_2, D_1 (respectively, D_2) successfully recovers R_1 (respectively, R_2) uncoded packets.

■

C. Butterfly Network with Co-Located Sinks

We consider the butterfly network with co-located sinks as shown in Fig. 3 without security constraints. An outer bound on the capacity region of this network is the cut-set bound, which is given in (3). We now design a transmission scheme that achieves the outer bound in (3). In particular,

Theorem III.5. *For the butterfly network with co-located sinks in Fig. 3, the following rate region is achievable:*

$$R_1 \leq \mathsf{C}_1 + \min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4\}, \tag{10a}$$
$$R_2 \leq \mathsf{C}_2 + \min\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_5\}, \tag{10b}$$
$$R_1 + R_2 \leq \min\{\mathsf{C}_3, \mathsf{C}_6 + \mathsf{C}_7\} + \min\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_5\} + \min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4\}. \tag{10c}$$

By straightforward manipulations, it is not difficult to see that the rate regions in (10) and (3) are equivalent. Hence, the rate region in (3) is the capacity region for the butterfly network with co-located sinks in Fig. 3.

Proof: Consider a rate pair (R_1, R_2) satisfying the constraints in (10). The transmission scheme is as follows.

- Source S_1 (respectively, S_2) sends $\min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4\}$ (respectively, $\min\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_5\}$) packets on edge 4 (respectively, edge 5). Moreover, S_1 (respectively, S_2) sends $R_1 - \min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4\}$ (respectively, $R_2 - \min\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_5\}$) packets on edge 1 (respectively, edge 2). These operations are possible thanks to the constraints in (10a) and in (10b).
- The intermediate nodes M_1 and M_2 simply send the $R_1 - \min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4\}$ packets of S_1 and the $R_2 - \min\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_5\}$ packets of S_2 on edge 3 and on the edge of capacity $\mathsf{C}_6 + \mathsf{C}_7$. This is possible thanks to the constraint in (10c).
- The destination successfully receives R_1 uncoded packets sent by S_1 and R_2 uncoded packets sent by S_2.

■

We now consider the network in Fig. 3 with security constraints. In particular

Theorem III.6. *For the butterfly network with co-located sinks in Fig. 3, the secure capacity region is given in* (6) *in Table I.*

Proof: We here prove that the rate region in (6) in Table I is achievable. The proof of the converse is provided in Appendix B. Consider a secure rate pair (R_1, R_2) satisfying the constraints in (6). The transmission scheme is as follows.

- Source S_1 (respectively, S_2) sends R_1 (respectively, R_2) random packets on edge 1 (respectively, 2). These packets are used in the generation of the secret key and we refer to them to as K_1 (respectively, K_2). These operations are possible thanks to the constraints in (6a) and in (6b). Moreover, S_1 (respectively, S_2) sends R_1 (respectively, R_2) message packets encrypted with the key K_1 (respectively, K_2) on edge 4 (respectively, edge 5). This is possible because of (6a) and (6b).
- The intermediate nodes M_1 and M_2 simply send the $R_1 + R_2$ random packets on edge 3 and on the edge of capacity $\mathsf{C}_6 + \mathsf{C}_7$, respectively. These operations are possible because of the constraints in (6c).
- The destination receives R_1 encrypted packets of S_1 on edge 4 and R_2 encrypted packets of S_2 on edge 5. Moreover, it also receives the keys K_1 and K_2 on the edge of capacity $\mathsf{C}_6 + \mathsf{C}_7$. Hence, by using the keys K_1 and K_2, it successfully recovers R_1 and R_2 uncoded packets of S_1 and S_2, respectively.

■

D. Butterfly Network 2

The last network we consider is the buttefly network 2 in Fig. 4, which differs from the buttefly network 1 in Fig. 1 since each source is also directly connected to the corresponding destination. The rate region in (4) is an outer bound on the capacity region of the butterfly network 2, where each constraint follows from the max-flow min-cut theorem. We now show that the rate region in (4) is achievable. In particular,

Theorem III.7. *For the butterfly network 2 in Fig. 4, the following rate region is achievable:*

$$R_1 \leq \min\{\mathsf{C}_1, \mathsf{C}_7\} + \min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4\}, \tag{11a}$$
$$R_2 \leq \min\{\mathsf{C}_2, \mathsf{C}_6\} + \min\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_5\}, \tag{11b}$$
$$R_1 + R_2 \leq \mathsf{C}_3 + \min\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_5\} + \min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4\}. \tag{11c}$$

It is not difficult to see that the rate regions in (11) and (4) are equivalent. Hence, the rate region in (4) is the capacity region for the butterfly network 2 in Fig. 4.

Proof: Consider a rate pair (R_1, R_2) satisfying the constraints in (11). The transmission scheme is as follows.

- Source S_1 (respectively, S_2) sends $\min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4\}$ (respectively, $\min\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_5\}$) packets on edge 4 (respectively, edge 5). Moreover, S_1 (respectively, S_2) sends $R_1 - \min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4\}$ (respectively, $R_2 - \min\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_5\}$) packets on edge 1 (respectively, edge 2). These operations are possible thanks to the constraints in (11a) and in (11b).
- The intermediate node M_1 sends $R_1 - \min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4\}$ packets of S_1 and $R_2 - \min\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_5\}$ packets of S_2 on edge 3, which is possible because of the constraint in (11c).
- The intermediate node M_2 sends $R_1 - \min\{R_1, \mathsf{C}_4\}$ packets of S_1 on edge 7. Similarly, M_2 sends $R_2 - \min\{R_2, \mathsf{C}_5\}$ packets of S_2 on edge 6. These operations are possible thanks to the constraints in (11a) and in (11b).
- Node D_1 (respectively, D_2) receives R_1 (respectively, R_2) uncoded packets of S_1 (respectively, S_2).

■

We now consider the network in Fig. 4 with security constraints. In particular,

Theorem III.8. *For the butterfly network 2 in Fig. 4, the secure capacity region is given in* (7) *in Table I.*

Proof: We here prove that the rate region in (7) in Table I is achievable. The proof of the converse is provided in Appendix C. Consider a secure rate pair (R_1, R_2) satisfying the constraints in (7). The transmission scheme is as follows.

- Source S_1 (respectively, S_2) sends R_1 (respectively, R_2) random packets on edge 1 (respectively, 2). These packets are used in the secret key generation and we refer to them to as K_1 (respectively, K_2). Moreover, S_1 (respectively, S_2) sends R_1 (respectively, R_2) message packets encrypted with the key K_1 (respectively, K_2) on edge 4 (respectively, 5). These operations are possible thanks to the constraints in (7a) and in (7b).

- The intermediate node M_1 simply sends the $R_1 + R_2$ random packets (K_1 and K_2) on edge 3. This operation is possible because of (7c).
- The intermediate node M_2 sends the R_1 random packets of S_1, i.e., K_1, on edge 7. Similarly, it sends the R_2 random packets of S_2, i.e., K_2, on edge 6. This is possible because of the constraints in (7a) and (7b).
- The destination D_1 (respectively, D_2) receives R_1 (respectively, R_2) encrypted message packets of S_1 (respectively, S_2). It also receives the key K_1 (respectively, K_2) on edge 7 (respectively, 6). Hence, by using K_1 (respectively, K_2), it successfully decodes R_1 (respectively, R_2) uncoded packets of S_1 (respectively, S_2).

■

IV. Summary and Discussion

In this paper we characterized the capacity of four two-unicast networks which are derived from the well-known butterfly network. In particular, we analyzed these networks with and without security constraints. Based on our analysis, we can draw the following conclusions.

1) There exist networks for which network coding operations are needed (for capacity characterization) in absence of security, but they do not provide any benefit under security constraints.
2) There are networks for which coding across sessions is not beneficial without security, but it becomes crucial with security considerations (see butterfly network with co-located sources).
3) Cooperation among sources and sinks increases the throughput both with and without security. We also observe that in case of security, if given an option of choosing between co-located sources or co-located destinations, the former brings higher throughput gains in case of uniform edge capacities. The results in this paper only consider the ultimate cooperation, i.e., we analyzed the case when the cooperation edge (between the two sources and the two sinks) is of infinite capacity (i.e., co-located nodes). Understanding how the rate advantages change with respect to the strength (finite capacity) of the cooperation link is an important open question, which is object of current investigation.

The capacity characterization for a general multiple-unicast network is a long-standing open problem. Several transmission schemes can be envisaged, one of which considers the butterfly network as a building block. Hence, by means of the closed-form expression capacity result for the butterfly network (as well as for the networks derived from it) with general edge capacities, high-throughput achieving strategies for a general multiple-unicast network can be designed both with and without security constraints.

Appendix A

We consider block coding with block length n and secret message rate $R_j, j \in [1:2]$. We let X_2^n, Y_2^n and Z_2^n be the signal transmitted by the source on the edge of capacity $\mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2$, the signal received by M_1 and the signal received by the possible eavesdropper on the edge of capacity $\mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2$, respectively. With this we have

$$\begin{aligned} nR_1 &\leq H(W_1) = I(W_1; Y_5^n) + H(W_1|Y_5^n) \\ &\overset{(a)}{<} \epsilon_n + H(W_1|Y_5^n) \\ &= I(W_1; Y_7^n|Y_5^n) + H(W_1|Y_5^n, Y_7^n) + \epsilon_n \\ &\overset{(b)}{\leq} I(W_1; Y_7^n|Y_5^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\ &\overset{(c)}{\leq} H(Y_7^n|Y_5^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\ &\overset{(d)}{\leq} H(Y_7^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \leq n\mathsf{C}_7 + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows because of the strong secrecy requirement; (ii) the inequality in (b) follows because of the decodability constraint; (iii) the inequality in (c) follows because the entropy of a discrete random variable is a non-negative quantity; (iv) finally, the inequality in (d) is due to the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle. By substituting the subscript 5 with 7 and vice versa in the above derivation, one can get the constraint $nR_1 \leq n\mathsf{C}_5 + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n$. By means of similar steps, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} nR_1 &< I(W_1; Y_3^n|Y_5^n) + H(W_1|Y_3^n, Y_5^n) + \epsilon_n \\ &\overset{(a)}{\leq} I(W_1; Y_3^n|Y_5^n) + H(W_1|Y_7^n, Y_5^n) + \epsilon_n \\ &\overset{(b)}{\leq} I(W_1; Y_3^n|Y_5^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\ &\overset{(c)}{\leq} H(Y_3^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \leq n\mathsf{C}_3 + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows since Y_7^n is a deterministic function of Y_3^n and because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (ii) the inequality in (b) follows because of the decodability constraint; (iii) finally, the inequality in (c) follows because the entropy of a discrete random variable is non-negative and because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle. By means of similar steps, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} nR_1 &< I(W_1; Y_2^n|Y_5^n) + H(W_1|Y_2^n, Y_5^n) + \epsilon_n \\ &\overset{(a)}{\leq} I(W_1; Y_2^n|Y_5^n) + H(W_1|Y_3^n, Y_5^n) + \epsilon_n \\ &\overset{(b)}{\leq} I(W_1; Y_2^n|Y_5^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\ &\overset{(c)}{\leq} H(Y_2^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \leq n(\mathsf{C}_1 + \mathsf{C}_2) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows since Y_3^n is a deterministic function of Y_2^n and because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (ii) the inequality in (b) follows from steps (a) and (b) in (13); (iii) finally, the inequality in (c) follows because the entropy of a discrete random variable is a non-negative quantity and because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle.

By dividing both sides of the above inequalities by n and by taking the limit for $n \to \infty$, we get the constraint in (5a). By following similar steps, one can derive the constraint in (5b).

APPENDIX B

We consider block coding with block length n and secret message rate $R_j, j \in [1:2]$. We let X_6^n, Y_6^n and Z_6^n be the signal transmitted by M_2, the signals received by the destination and by the possible eavesdropper on the edge of capacity $\mathsf{C}_6 + \mathsf{C}_7$, respectively. With this we have

$$\begin{aligned}
nR_1 &\leq H(W_1) = I(W_1; Y_4^n) + H(W_1|Y_4^n) \\
&\overset{(a)}{<} I(W_1; Y_5^n, Y_6^n|Y_4^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} I(W_1; Y_5^n, Y_3^n|Y_4^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} I(W_1; Y_1^n, Y_2^n, Y_5^n|Y_4^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} H(Y_1^n, Y_2^n, Y_5^n|Y_4^n) - H(Y_1^n, Y_2^n, Y_5^n|Y_4^n, W_1, \Theta_1) \\
&\quad + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(e)}{=} H(Y_1^n, Y_2^n, Y_5^n|Y_4^n) - H(Y_1^n, Y_2^n, Y_5^n|W_1, \Theta_1) \\
&\quad + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(f)}{=} H(Y_2^n, Y_5^n|Y_4^n) - H(Y_2^n, Y_5^n) + H(Y_1^n|Y_2^n, Y_4^n, Y_5^n) \\
&\quad - H(Y_1^n|W_1, \Theta_1, Y_2^n, Y_5^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(g)}{\leq} H(Y_1^n|Y_2^n, Y_4^n, Y_5^n) - H(Y_1^n|W_1, \Theta_1, Y_2^n, Y_5^n) \\
&\quad + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(h)}{\leq} H(Y_1^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \leq n\mathsf{C}_1 + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n, \qquad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows because of the strong secrecy and the decodability constraints; (ii) the inequality in (b) follows because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle and since Y_6^n is uniquely determined given Y_3^n; (iii) the inequality in (c) follows because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle and since Y_3^n is uniquely determined given (Y_1^n, Y_2^n); (iv) the inequality in (d) is due to the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (v) the equality in (e) follows since Y_4^n is a deterministic function of (W_1, Θ_1); (vi) the equality in (f) follows since (Y_2^n, Y_5^n) is independent of (W_1, Θ_1); (vii) the inequality in (g) is due to the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (viii) finally, the inequality in (h) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is non-negative and because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle. By means of similar steps as in (15) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
nR_1 &\leq H(W_1) = I(W_1; Y_1^n) + H(W_1|Y_1^n) \\
&< I(W_1; Y_2^n, Y_4^n, Y_5^n|Y_1^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\leq H(Y_4^n|Y_1^n, Y_2^n, Y_5^n) - H(Y_4^n|W_1, \Theta_1, Y_2^n, Y_5^n) \\
&\quad + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\leq H(Y_4^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \leq n\mathsf{C}_4 + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n. \qquad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

We now prove the outer bound in (6c). In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
n(R_1 + R_2) &\leq H(W_1, W_2) \\
&= I(W_1, W_2; Y_4^n, Y_5^n) + H(W_1, W_2|Y_4^n, Y_5^n) \\
&\overset{(a)}{<} I(W_1, W_2; Y_5^n|Y_4^n) + H(W_1, W_2|Y_4^n, Y_5^n) + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} H(Y_5^n|Y_4^n) - H(Y_5^n|W_1, \Theta_1, W_2) \\
&\quad + H(W_1, W_2|Y_4^n, Y_5^n) + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} I(W_2; Y_5^n|W_1, \Theta_1) + H(W_1, W_2|Y_4^n, Y_5^n) + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(d)}{=} I(W_2; W_1, \Theta_1|Y_5^n) + I(W_2; Y_5^n) \\
&\quad + H(W_1, W_2|Y_4^n, Y_5^n) + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(e)}{\leq} H(W_1, \Theta_1|Y_5^n) - H(W_1, \Theta_1|W_2, \Theta_2) \\
&\quad + I(W_2; Y_5^n) + H(W_1, W_2|Y_4^n, Y_5^n) + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(f)}{<} H(W_1, W_2|Y_4^n, Y_5^n) + 2\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(g)}{\leq} I(W_1, W_2; Y_6^n|Y_4^n, Y_5^n) + n\epsilon_n + 2\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(h)}{\leq} H(Y_6^n) + n\epsilon_n + 2\epsilon_n \leq n(\mathsf{C}_6 + \mathsf{C}_7) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n, \qquad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows because of the strong secrecy constraint; (ii) the inequality in (b) is due to the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle and since Y_4^n is a deterministic function of (W_1, Θ_1); (iii) the inequality in (c) is due to the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle and to the fact that Y_5^n is independent of (W_1, Θ_1); (iv) the equality in (d) follows since W_2 is independent of (W_1, Θ_1); (v) the inequality in (e) follows because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle and because Y_5^n is uniquely determined given (W_2, Θ_2); (vi) the inequality in (f) follows because of the strong secrecy constraint, because (W_1, Θ_1) is independent of (W_2, Θ_2) and because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (vii) the inequality in (g) follows from the decodability constraint; (viii) finally, the inequality in (h) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is non-negative and because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
n(R_1 + R_2) &\overset{(a)}{\leq} I(W_1, W_2; Y_6^n|Y_4^n, Y_5^n) + n\epsilon_n + 2\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} I(W_1, W_2; Y_3^n|Y_4^n, Y_5^n) + n\epsilon_n + 2\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} H(Y_3^n) + n\epsilon_n + 2\epsilon_n \leq n\mathsf{C}_3 + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n, \qquad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows from the steps (a)-(g) in (17); (ii) the inequality in (b) follows because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle and since Y_6^n is uniquely determined given Y_3^n; (iii) finally, the inequality in (c) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is non-negative and because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle.

By dividing both sides of the above inequalities by n and by taking the limit for $n \to \infty$, we get the constraints in (6a)

and in (6c). By following similar steps as in (15) and in (16), one can derive the constraint on R_2 in (6b).

APPENDIX C

We consider block coding with block length n and secret message rate $R_j, j \in [1:2]$. By following similar steps as in (12) with: (i) the subscript 5 replaced by 4, it is straightforward to prove $nR_1 \leq n\mathsf{C}_7 + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n$; (ii) the subscript 5 replaced by 7 and the subscript 7 replaced by 4, it is straightforward to prove $nR_1 \leq n\mathsf{C}_4 + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n$. Similarly, by following the same steps as in (13) with the subscript 5 replaced by 4, one can easily prove $nR_1 \leq n\mathsf{C}_3 + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n$. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
nR_1 &\leq H(W_1) = I(W_1; Y_4^n) + H(W_1|Y_4^n) \\
&\overset{(a)}{<} I(W_1; Y_7^n|Y_4^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} I(W_1; Y_3^n|Y_4^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} I(W_1; Y_1^n, Y_2^n|Y_4^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} H(Y_1^n, Y_2^n|Y_4^n) - H(Y_1^n, Y_2^n|Y_4^n, W_1, \Theta_1) \\
&\quad + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(e)}{\leq} H(Y_1^n, Y_2^n|Y_4^n) - H(Y_1^n, Y_2^n|W_1, \Theta_1) \\
&\quad + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(f)}{=} H(Y_2^n|Y_4^n) - H(Y_2^n) + H(Y_1^n|Y_2^n, Y_4^n) \\
&\quad - H(Y_1^n|W_1, \Theta_1, Y_2^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(g)}{\leq} H(Y_1^n|Y_2^n, Y_4^n) - H(Y_1^n|W_1, \Theta_1, Y_2^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(h)}{\leq} H(Y_1^n) + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n \leq n\mathsf{C}_1 + n\epsilon_n + \epsilon_n, \qquad (19)
\end{aligned}$$

(i) the inequality in (a) follows because of the strong secrecy and the decodability constraints; (ii) the inequality in (b) follows because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle and since Y_7^n is uniquely determined given Y_3^n; (iii) the inequality in (c) follows because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle and since Y_3^n is uniquely determined given (Y_1^n, Y_2^n); (iv) the inequality in (d) is due to the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (v) the equality in (e) follows since Y_4^n is a deterministic function of (W_1, Θ_1); (vi) the equality in (f) follows since Y_2^n is independent of (W_1, Θ_1); (vii) the inequality in (g) is due to the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle; (viii) finally, the inequality in (h) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is non-negative and because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle.

We now prove the sum-rate outer bound in (7c). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
n(R_1 + R_2) &\overset{(a)}{<} H(W_1, W_2|Y_4^n, Y_5^n) + 2\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} I(W_1, W_2; Y_6^n, Y_7^n|Y_4^n, Y_5^n) + n\epsilon_n + 2\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} I(W_1, W_2; Y_3^n|Y_4^n, Y_5^n) + n\epsilon_n + 2\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} H(Y_3^n) + n\epsilon_n + 2\epsilon_n \leq n\mathsf{C}_3 + n\epsilon_n + 2\epsilon_n, \qquad (20)
\end{aligned}$$

where: (i) the inequality in (a) follows by similar steps as in (a)-(f) in (17); (ii) the inequality in (b) follows from the decodability constraint; (iii) the inequality in (c) follows because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle and since (Y_6^n, Y_7^n) is uniquely determined given Y_3^n; (iv) finally, the inequality in (d) follows since the entropy of a discrete random variable is non-negative and because of the 'conditioning reduces the entropy' principle.

By dividing both sides of the above inequalities by n and by taking the limit for $n \to \infty$, we get the constraints in (7a) and in (7c). By following similar steps as done for deriving (7a), one can derive the constraint on R_2 in (7b).

REFERENCES

[1] S. Kamath, D. N. C. Tse, and C. C. Wang, "Two-unicast is hard," in *2014 IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theory*, June 2014, pp. 2147–2151.

[2] C. C. Wang and N. B. Shroff, "Pairwise intersession network coding on directed networks," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 8, pp. 3879–3900, Aug 2010.

[3] S. Y. R. Li, R. W. Yeung, and N. Cai, "Linear network coding," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 371–381, Feb 2003.

[4] R. Dougherty, C. Freiling, and K. Zeger, "Insufficiency of linear coding in network information flow," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 8, pp. 2745–2759, Aug 2005.

[5] D. Traskov, N. Ratnakar, D. S. Lun, R. Koetter, and M. Medard, "Network coding for multiple unicasts: An approach based on linear optimization," in *2006 IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theory*, July 2006, pp. 1758–1762.

[6] N. Cai and R. W. Yeung, "Secure network coding on a wiretap network," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 424–435, Jan 2011.

[7] T. Cui, T. Ho, and J. Kliewer, "On secure network coding with unequal link capacities and restricted wiretapping sets," in *2010 IEEE Inf. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, Aug 2010, pp. 1–5.

[8] S. U. Kamath, D. N. C. Tse, and V. Anantharam, "Generalized network sharing outer bound and the two-unicast problem," in *2011 Int. Symp. on Networking Coding*, July 2011, pp. 1–6.

[9] G. K. Agarwal, M. Cardone, and C. Fragouli, "On secure network coding for two unicast sessions," *to appear in 2016 IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theory, arXiv:1601.05137*, July 2016.